DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 437 CE 007 175

TITLE	Presentations Before the Joint Meeting: National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (Washington, D.C., May 1-2, 1975).
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 75
NOTE	63p.; For related documents, see CE 007 171-175
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Conference Reports; *Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; *Educational Problems; Federal Aid; Government Role; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	NACVE; National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education; SACVE; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The document provides the texts of the presentations given during the joint meeting of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education held in May, 1975. The agenda for the meeting and the resolution established in the meeting are included. The presentations focused on the challenges to vocational education as perceived by the following speakers: (1) John W. Thiele, discussing the current problems encountered in vocational education based on national, State, and local needs; (2) W. Hughes Brockbank, discussing the availability of Federal resources and the resources which can be provided by State and local treasuries; (3) Jean B. Purvis, discussing the activities of the Pennsylvania State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education and the findings of the General Accounting Office Report; (4) Roman Pucinski, discussing some of the pending legislative proposals and the role of advisory councils; (5) Gregory J. Ahart, discussing the approach of the General Accounting Office to vocational education; and (6) Caspar W. Weinberger, discussing the economic problems encountered in the educational field and a legislative proposal for the use of Federal aid and for simplifying the administration of vocational education programs at the State level. (EC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123437

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PRESENTATIONS BEFORE THE JOINT MEETING

national and state advisory councils on vocational education

may 1975

CE007175

contents

	Page
AGENDA	5
RESOLUTION	7
PRESENTATIONS	
Mr. John W. Thiele *Chairman, NACVE*	11
Senator W. Hughes Brockbank *Council Member, NACVE*	21
Mrs. Jean B. Purvis *Chairman, Pennsylvania SACVE*	31
The Honorable Roman Pucinski *Council Member, NACVE*	39
Mr. Gregory J. Ahart *Director, Manpower & Welfare* *U.S. General Accounting Office*	56
The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger *Secretary* *U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare*	67

AGENDA
JOINT MEETING

MAY 1

8:00 am — **REGISTRATION**

9:00 am — **WELCOME**

Mr. Albert Long
Chairman
District of Columbia SACVE

PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. Clinton L. Harris
Joint Meeting Co-Chairman
Wyoming SACVE

THE CHALLENGE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION -- NACVE OVERVIEW

Mr. John W. Thiele
Chairman
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education

PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Rep. John M. Lipton
Arkansas SACVE

UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL RESOURCES

Senator W. Hughes Brockbank
NACVE

ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. Jean B. Purvis
Chairman
Pennsylvania SACVE

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Moderator: Mr. Rudolph Girandola
New Jersey SACVE

NOON — **LUNCHEON**

Speakers: Mr. Roger Semerad
White House Domestic Council

The Honorable Roman Pucinski
NACVE

1:15 pm — *THE CHALLENGE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION*

ADDRESSES:

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart
Director, Manpower and
Welfare Division
Government Accounting Office

Introduction: Mr. Roger O. Gagne
Chairman
New Hampshire SACVE

Mr. Pierce A. Quinlan
Associate Manpower Administrator
U.S. Department of Labor

Introduction: Mrs. Helen Stuart
Chairman
South Carolina SACVE

The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger
Secretary
U.S. Department of H.E.W.

Introduction: Mr. Hewitt Youtz
Chairman
Wyoming SACVE

4:30pm — **ADJOURN**

MAY 2

7:30am — **BREAKFAST AND GENERAL BUSINESS**

9:00am — **INTRODUCTION TO SECOND DAY**

Mr. Lanny Hassell
Joint Meeting Co-Chairman
Arkansas SACVE

THE CHALLENGE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

ADDRESSES:

Mr. John F. Jennings
General Counsel
House Sub-Committee on Elementary
Secondary and Vocational Education

Mr. Charles W. Radcliffe
Minority Counsel
House Committee on Education
and Labor

Ms. Jean S. Frohlicher
Associate Counsel
Senate Sub-Committee on Education

Mr. Gregory Fusco
Minority Counsel
Senate Sub-Committee on Education

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Moderator: Mr. Hassell

11:30am — **GENERAL BUSINESS SESSION**

NOON — **ADJOURN**

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
in Joint Conference with
Representatives of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education
May 1-2, 1975
Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS: There exists a multiplicity of problems in vocational education due primarily to the current administrative structure and absence of adequate leadership at the Federal level, and

WHEREAS: The education and training goals of the manpower training program in the Department of Labor relate directly to the broader goals of vocational and technical education in the U. S. Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and

WHEREAS: The time and attention required and devoted to Health and Welfare programs of the Department of H.E.W. limits direct and proper attention to educational problems, including vocational education, and

WHEREAS: Education and manpower training contributions are of such consequence to our citizens and our economy that the highest level of government decision-making must be applied to problems within these areas, and

WHEREAS: The needs of individuals and of the Nation can best be served by an integrated educational effort, starting with parent education and continuing throughout the work life of the individual, and

WHEREAS: There is overlapping, duplication and waste of both human and financial resources under the present structure,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The delegates in attendance at this May 1975 Joint Meeting of State Advisory Councils and the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education strongly urge action on the part of the President and Congress to establish a Department of Education and Manpower, at a Cabinet status level.

APPROVED BY MAJORITY VOTE OF THOSE DELEGATES PRESENT:

Clinton L. Harris, Executive
Director, Wyoming SACVE
Co-Chairman

Lanny W. Hassell, Executive
Director, Arkansas SACVE
Co-Chairman

PRESENTATIONS

THE CHALLENGE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Remarks Presented By

John W. Thiele, Chairman
The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

NACVE/SACVE JOINT MEETING

Washington, D. C.

May 1-2, 1975

The Conference Theme this Spring is certainly appropriate to the times and problems facing the people of this Nation. "The Challenge to Vocational Education" is upon us. The economy, with a deepening recession and resulting unemployment, growing federal deficit spending, diminishing supplies of our basic natural resources, unresolved social ills, both in the urban and suburban sections of this Nation, as well as rural America, create a somber setting to the content of this meeting. And now, as Roman Pucinski pointed out yesterday at the House Hearing, we are into the post-Vietnam period with all of its resulting problems and opportunities.

Last Fall in Scottsdale, we considered "the changing responsibilities of Advisory Councils in meeting the needs of people." Now, in what appears to be a natural evolution in terms of the conditions I just described, we address ourselves to the sobering challenges -- now, and future.

Our timing could not be better. The Administration, through a recently reorganized Domestic Council, is developing new approaches and policies.

A young and vigorous, reorganized Congress is examining its role relative to the Executive Branch, in the legislative arena. Vocational Education legislation is currently being considered through Committee Hearings in both Senate and House. We have arrived at a critical crossroad for Vocational Education and the opportunity for substantial advisory council action is upon us.

In response to urgent needs you were expressing, the National Advisory Council developed two position papers addressing these challenges early this year. One has been published in our January Newsletter. We called the statement "The Challenge to Vocational Education in the Economic Crisis," but the National Council was not talking just about the present. The decisions we make now, the actions we take, affect the future. The recommendations we made, our challenge, was directed to ourselves, as well as to State Councils, Administrators, Directors, and all of the vocational education community.

Essentially, we said these things:

- Be certain that we are providing appropriate and accelerated training to enable people to fill jobs that currently or will exist. We need to work with those agencies which survey the job markets, to assess job needs and opportunities.

- Look at the Curriculum - Can adults return to the schools to train or upgrade specific skills? Are there short speciality courses? Place emphasis on flexible new programs

responsive to current and future job needs. Phase out obsolete programs.

- Build Linkages - We need to coordinate with such programs as CETA to avoid duplication, to improve the quality of training and education available, and to provide a comprehensive educational delivery system.

- Utilize the mandatory set-asides and discretionary funds to their maximum potential.

Overall, we must recognize the current needs of people in a rapidly changing economy. We need to provide flexible and meaningful training in those areas which have the greatest effect upon their livelihood -- their occupations, their careers, and their ability to cope in an economic crisis. This is not a period for the normal "business as usual" approach.

Our second paper has not been published. I would like to take this opportunity to first review it with you before we do so.

The title of the paper is "Reclaiming the Skills and Productivity of the American People." The text of the recommendation is as follows:

"America is rapidly losing the technical superiority that has been the base of our prosperity, and our proudest export. American will never again be particularly rich in natural resources. We have been rich in skill! Our competitive position in world markets was built on the superb technical skills and productivity of our people. We are losing that edge. We must reclaim it. The key is a major reshaping of our educational system through strong leadership.

"A few specialists have been saying for years that we are mis-educating at least half of our young people. But now -- in the last two years -- that perception has become a part of the conventional wisdom. The negative correlation between school enrollments and probable job opportunities has become a familiar subject in the popular press.

"Public concern has been greatly influenced by the economic crisis facing the world. What has been tolerable in good times becomes intolerable when times are not as good.

"Miseducation works terrible hardships on the individuals affected by it. Even in times of recession, skilled manpower remains in short supply, and the workers hardest hit by recession are the unskilled and the underskilled. We must be responsive to these realities.

"The Federal Government must do two things: It must show its awareness and concern, and it must find an effective way to act on that heightened concern. A powerful incentive to reform must be established.

"It must be the policy of the United States to reclaim the skills and productivity of the American people. To strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in support of this policy, we recommend the appointment of a Presidential Counselor on Education for Employment. We suggest the following:

1. To develop plans for a coordinated interagency educational delivery system to reclaim the skills and productivity of the American people;

2. To maximize the effectiveness of current resources already in place and available through existing agencies;

3. To redirect twenty-five percent of the discretionary funds currently available within appropriate agencies and distribute them on an incentive principle to programs which place highest emphasis on education for employment and productivity;

4. To identify, develop, and disseminate curriculum which will meet the new and emerging vocational needs of our changing economy and technology;

5. To gather, in cooperation with agencies involved, information and data which will provide the bases for recommendations to Congress to achieve an effective program for education for employment."

In the background paper to this proposal, it is pointed out that "the goal to be achieved is a coordinated, cohesive, federal policy in the area of job-related education and training, and a flexible and responsive operational capability to back up that policy. The purpose is not the creation of new programs, or the expenditure of additional funds. It is to get the most out of existing programs, prevent the duplication and waste which currently exist, eliminate competition between programs, and overcome the lack of knowledge and information where it presently exists.

A coordinated approach to this problem would provide a program responsive to the complex interaction of the job-related education and training needs of students and adults, the business community, labor, the job market, and the nation's economy. These programs presently are spread through the Federal Government, and too often one agency is unaware of the related activities of another, if not actually working at cross-purposes.

Education, in the public mind, has always been, and still remains, the key to success. In addition to basic literacy skills, the public still looks to the educational system for the preparation of job skills, whether secretary or scientist. Our society is based on the premise that educational attainment and the quality of education determine career advancement -- the better the education, the better the job.

We have devised numerous programs, costing billions of dollars, and spread throughout many federal agencies, to make up for the deficiencies of the educational system in meeting its historic function of career preparation. We have a proliferation of vocational, manpower, apprentice, rehabilitation, and other programs. The result is duplication, overlap, inefficiency, and waste, as the various bureaucracies compete with one another.

Despite these programs, neither our schools nor the manpower training efforts are meeting the needs of youth, adults, business, our communities, the unemployed, or our society as a whole. Our unemployment rate continues to soar, especially in densely populated areas, and particularly among minorities. We are not producing the skilled manpower required by our economy. Many of our other social ills, such as crime, drug addiction, and welfare dependency, can be traced to these inadequacies in meeting the employment needs of youth, and the retraining needs of adults.

One of the key concerns should be to provide much closer coordination between the vocational and manpower programs. The CETA bill provides a minimum five percent set-aside for vocational education, which was provided to promote cooperation. But that is not likely to have much effect without constant encouragement. It should promote, with the help of NIE, changes in vocational education curriculum, class structure, and traditional hours for use of school facilities, where needed, to permit the greater interaction between school and manpower programs.

Emphasis should be placed on coordinating all guidance, counseling, and placement activities. The U. S. Employment Service, Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Center for Educational Statistics, Veterans Administration Counseling and outreach programs, Armed Forces Recruitment programs, and counseling and placement programs in the schools, all should be attuned to each other. Curriculum development activities should also be tied in to many of the above programs, so that short-range, as well as long-range and traditional programs can be developed to meet pressing needs."

We then listed fourteen current and separate programs which should be considered for interagency cooperation and coordination.

As I mentioned earlier, the National Advisory Council is also aware of the urgen concerns and unmet need you have expressed in the individual SACVE reports. We are listening to what you have to say, and we are trying to respond to the problems you have identified. Our new Committee structure allows a concentration of efforts so that we can accommodate your needs in relation to our Congressional mandate as

efficiently as possible.

You have expressed great concern over the lack of an accurate data system. Comprehensive data is essential if we are to have statewide planning which reflects the labor market and community needs. We have testified to this effect, and have recommended that Congress direct the National Center for Educational Statistics to develop a common set of definitions, and a common data system for reporting all federally funded vocational education programs.

We have also made other specific recommendations to Congress, such as:

- The importance of the State Plan as a planning mechanism should be re-emphasized. It should be a five-year plan, with annual reports on progress.
- Two or three-year forward funding of Vocational Education should be instituted if there has been solid, long-range planning, and a needs assessment has been conducted.
- No more than thirty percent of Federal funds should be used for maintenance of effort without justification in the State Plan. The U. S. Commissioner of Education should be the final arbiter with power to require amendment to the State Plan to correct any imbalance.
- A special program of crash funding is needed for Vocational Education to urban areas without reduction of funds to rural and suburban communities.

These recommendations are included in the list of NACVE recommendations on the last page of our Testimony. I understand that everyone received a copy of that testimony in the folder for this Meeting.

State Councils have expressed an overwhelming need to re-orient the guidance and counseling profession to the world of work. Your approaches to this problem have been diverse and successful. Workshops have been conducted in several states to familiarize both teachers and guidance counselors with vocational knowledge. The trend is clear. Across the country, the states are addressing this great need to be certain that guidance counselors have knowledge of vocational education and career opportunities. Earlier this week, for example, a Joint conference was sponsored with the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the Guidance Division of the AVA. Workshops were conducted which focused on the guidance concerns identified by you and addressed in the National Advisory Council's Sixth Report.

As I told you in Scottsdale, in considering the changing responsibilities of Advisory Councils, we reorganized our Committee structure to meet the challenges to Vocational Education, as well as our legal mandate. The Research and Evaluation Committee is reviewing guidelines for the prepartion of your Annual Reports. Inter-governmental Agencies Committee is building linkages with Federal agencies to promote the open-door communication necessary to see States' concerns and problems addressed at the Federal level. Program Review Committee is becoming more and more involved in reviewing your programs to work with you in solving concerns in areas of duplication and resource utilization and to keep abreast of trends and problems in programmatic areas.

Today, I have some new concerns which we all might consider.

I have already mentioned the requirement for more flexibility and responsiveness in Vocational Education to <u>today's</u> and <u>tomorrow's</u> needs.

We are well aware of the demand for more realistic and effective planning.

Our two papers call for new leadership to create a <u>truly</u> comprehensive educational delivery system with the elimination of overlap, duplication, and resulting waste of resources.

This duplication at the local level creates costly and inefficient administrative systems. Appropriations the past few years, with minor exception, have not kept pace with increased costs in program administration. Thus, we have fewer and fewer "real" dollars to provide additional training.

We are all familiar with -- but do little about -- this growing problem, which today is causing actual expensive competition among schools for available students.

How many of you can name some school which is either recruiting or counseling students to obsolete or over-populated career patterns?

One of the most important concerns facing education today is the matter of accountability, a sense of direct responsibility for quality to the student. Perhaps in the last decade or so, we have evolved from a consumer (or student) emphasis to an institutional base. We now judge ourselves by the size of our budgets and Federal grants which we receive, the size of our campuses, the numbers of new buildings and equipment, teachers' salaries, and athletic programs, rather than the quality of our training programs, or the results of our work. We need to look less at what we are doing, and more at how well we are performing. It is time to cease looking at education from an institutional perspective and to again place more emphasis on the student's diverse range of needs.

We might also take the same type of approach to our physical plant. Is it being fully utilized, most efficiently, and productively operated? Or are our traditional school terms or class hours both limiting the full utilization of the plant, as well as the training opportunity for the students?

This is the National Council's overview of the issues facing all of us, the issues we will be addressing during this meeting. They are common concerns, and I know each of us will be keeping them in mind as we listen to the presentations from the State and National Council speakers, the Government Agency Representatives, and Congressional staffs.

Most of us have grown up and worked during the last thirty years through the period that may be looked back upon as the "Golden years of this Century, in spite of the civil strife of the late '60's. And the age was "Golden" -- one that might be characterized as wasteful. Wasteful of resources, manpower, and money. The proliferation of a vast governmental bureaucracy and its special problems - such as duplication of programs, at all levels - has become an administrative nightmare at the local level.

One of our greatest failures in the last decade in the public sector has been to pyramid program upon program in attempting to solve old problems that yet go unsolved. We never seem to be able to go back, review and audit what we have already done, and make the necessary corrections and adjustments in existing programs to ensure their success. We have the same problems within our industrial organizations. I feel it is directly related to what I call the "looking good" syndrome. We are all afraid for our job security, of failure -- a poor performance review -- the loss of a contract -- the loss of federal funds, or what have you. Instead of going back and correcting what we have already done, making admissions of failures or mistakes where need be, and then making necessary improvements for the future, we tend to try to take the attention off these failures mistakes by creating new programs, new ideas, or new research projects, which are more exciting, and tend to fog over our past failures, hope people will forget. Often, the result is we have highly segmented, poorly coordinated, non-productive efforts which cause a great deal of dissatisfaction and ill will from unfounded expectations, as well as wasting vast sums of money.

John Gardner -- one of our past HEW Secretaries -- had this to say about failure, as it relates to learning:

> "We pay a heavy price for our fear of failure. It is a powerful obstacle to growth. It assures the progressive narrowing of the personality, and prevents exploration and experimentation. There is no learning without some difficulty and fumbling. If you want to keep on learning, you must keep on risking failure all your life."

Last fall, at the Joint Meeting, I challenged you in three areas:

- Define your responsibilities as Advisory Councils.
- Review your relationship with your various agencies.
- Review your staff activities.

I suggested that the days of "Vocational Isolationism," the arm waving, the shouting, the back slapping, are over.

I assume you have carried out all of these responsibilities, and are now ready to meet the "Challenge", to ask the tough questions, and to reach the hard decisions.

These are difficult times which require tough minded and creative answers.

With strong leadership, we can help provide to Vocational Education -- we can all assist this great country to grow during this bicentennial decade, to new levels of national attainment in terms of individual growth and fulfillment, in a climate of world peace and progress for mankind.

Again, I am pleased to be part of this meeting because we are focusing on critical issues of National, State and Local concern. It's great to see such active participation from all of the States and Territories.

Thank you.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1 - 2, 1975
Washington, D. C.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE W. HUGHES BROCKBANK

Council Member

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE Meeting
May 1, 1975

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE W. HUGHES BROCKBANK

Introduction by Chairman John W. Thiele -

Thank you, Jack.

The delay of my flight out of Salt Lake City last Monday due to an improperly hatched door made me think -- what did that cost American Airlines because someone didn't have pride in his work? What did that cost us, as passengers, in the way of anxiety because someone didn't have pride in his work?

I think today, that the American worker -- and I'm one of them, Jack's one of them -- has somehow lost pride in his work. I think part of the failure in the auto industry today is because people don't want to buy because they say the old '63 and '65 cars were constructed and made better. And so inasmuch as you asked me to speak -- and that's not my subject -- I want to bring a little moral issue in. I think it's time that you, as SACVE Members, also take a little opportunity and time to study how you can convince the educational system to teach this. We've depended upon the churches, and the family, and the schools, to teach it. Somewhere, there's a failure. And so, if I leave you only one message today, I hope you will take that home and say, it's time that America starts giving to its workers the sense that they should take pride in their work.

Now, my subject today is on the availability of federal resources -- that's not the original subject I was assigned -- I was assigned to tell them how they could more effectively work with their legislature. Well, I'll tell you what the federal resources are first. There's a little sheet out there in the lobby as you came in -- that'll tell you that for FY'76, the appropriation of federal dollars is going to be the same as FY'75. The House has already passed the bill, it looks like it will go through the Senate, the same figure, so you'll receive no more additional federal dollars. So don't look to the federal Treasury for that. But you've got another treasury you can look to. And what is that treasury? That's the State treasury and the local treasury.

Let me give you an example of what I'm talking about. In our secondary vocational education program in Utah last year, we spent about $26,061,000 of local and state dollars. And what did we get from the Feds? We go $4,000,316 of which we had two skill centers that drew a million and a half and subtracted, so we got about two million eight. Relate that -- that's about $1.00 Fed, to $10.00 of local, and I'm not talking about post-secondary. Now, when I look at the mandated programs of what the Feds tell us to do in the paper work, frankly, ladies and gentlemen, as a legislator, I'd like to tell them to keep it back here, and let us run our own institutions the way we want to do it. And if you talk to any administrator, he'll tell you the same thing. It's the old story of the tail wagging the dog.

Now, where should you put your attention? Well, if you were on a mine, and you were digging in the mine, and all of a sudden you found $10.00 ore, on the one hand, and $1.00 ore on the other, where

would you put your equipment to work? You'd put your equipment to work for that $10.00 ore wouldn't you? If you didn't, people would say you're stupid, and I think that's what you have to do.

I think we've got this -- I want to say a naughty word, Ms. Purvis -- we've got this damned federal syndrome - we look to Washington for all the answers, but I think just as Representative Lipton says, there's answers that can be handled in your state legislature. And what I'm here to tell you is how to work with those state legislatures. It's a simple job. It's the old story of how to win friends and influence people. And that's what you're attempting to do.

Let me talk to you about it from the standpoint of the legislative session. A typical day in the life of a legislator that operates part-time as we do, and the majority of the state legislators are part-time legislators, they're citizen legislators, we're in session in Utah for sixty days -- I say to you it's sixty days and sixty nights -- it's around the clock. I'm usually at breakfast with some constituents or some special interest groups, getting their story. At eight o'clock, I'm in a Committee meeting, at ten o'clock in a general session, at twelve I've a lunch with some constituents of special interest, at two o'clock back on the floor, four o'clock in a committee meeting maybe to five, six, or seven; again you're taken to dinner by somebody who tells you what it is, you get home at ten or eleven, you go to sleep, you get up at three o'clock and start to read your bills, or maybe take a catnap between six and seven, and you're back at it again. Now, I don't know whether it's any different down in your state or not, but that's how it is in our state. Now, how are you able to get in a little input? When do you catch your legislators? I'm saying to you this -- that you have

a story to tell, and you should start telling it 365 days of the year. You have a great constituency, you know, in your SACVE Boards, and every one of those have a Representative, or Senator representing them so have them during the year contact and tell the vocational education story. Don't wait 'til that session. If you wait until that session you can see the time limitation that you'd have to tell the story. Get with your group and have them start telling the story. Nothing happens until someone gets excited. Representative Lipton says how he's excited. What'd he have? A bill that increased the state contributions 240%. Well, somehow or other, I got excited. How'd I get excited? That was before we had SACVE's. We had a fellow by name of J. Nelson who was President of an area trade technical school, supported by three school districts in our state. He got me excited because we went deer hunting and you know, when you're sitting up there waiting for a buck to come into view, you know how you sit there and you just yak, and he kept telling me about vocational education. And the first thing you know he had me changing the name of his school to a new name, and the next thing he had me do was bring it into the school system of the state where it got state dollars. And the next thing he had me move it -- -- from the old, moderate buildings they were in down to a new campus, and I sponsored the whole legislation, and we built new buildings, and I got excited about it. Because he was telling me the story. You people have the greatest story in the world to tell, and all I'm urging you to do is tell it, and get the legislator excited.

Look, let me just skip a moment and tell you what -- this last time I was so excited -- we have a bonding limitation like everybody else,

but what we need is some capitol improvements. If we hadn't our bonding limitation, we could bond our state for about 70 to 80 million dollars. Sponsored legislation bonded our state. And what did we get out of it? We got expansion to our medical school for 34.9 million. Now if you don't think the medical school isn't vocational education, you're wrong. Go and see them. See how many medical technicians are training, nurses, pharmacists, and on and on, as well as doctors. And then there was about 20.2 million -- so 55 million dollars of a 70 million dollar appropriation for capitol improvement was for vocational education. We have three community colleges. Everyone of them got an additional vocational education building. We appropriated money for my friend Senator Dean who lives in Provost, who had an area vocational school which we had to keep up with the Salt Lake vocational school or technical school -- we got him a new campus; we're going to build him a new campus; we're going to build him buildings, and we're going to add another building on the Salt Lake Trade-Tech Campus.

Well, we're going back to the old vocational area schools again. There's two million and a half for two vocational trade area schools -- I was the guy that sponsored the greatest schools back in the state system and I'm taking them and building them up and putting them back in them. And I got excited because of J. Nelson.

But that shows you what you can do if you get a legislator excited. Well, let me talk about in the session -- I talked about the time -- but there are some things you can do. Jack Higbee, our Executive Director, spoke to me and we arranged for him to appear before the higher education Subcommittee, and he spoke for fifteen minutes with these flip-charts that started to tell the story. He had me pass out his little yearly

report called "The Senators," and I'm sure he did the same in the House. And he kept telling the story -- what's happened since, he's appeared before the State Board of Regents to tell the story; he's appeared before the State Board of Education. We've made so much progress -- we have the single board -- it's an elected board of eleven members called the State Board of Education -- one minute they've got their hat on as State Board Members, and the next minute they take the same people, put them over here, and they put a hat on and they're the Vocational Education Board -- that's how we have it in Utah. And do you know, up until this last year, they never met officially as a State Board of Vocational Education. But because guys like Jack Higbee and his members of his Advisory Council they now spend one day exclusively to vocational education. Vocational Education, fellow advisory council members, is becoming known, is becoming respectable, and it's because of people like you who are involved in it.

So I'm saying to you, not only do you spend your time during a session, but between a session, using these people. Jack has some great people. I'll never forget -- he told me today that Dick Prouse hired him when our Advisory Council was created. This young man has built more condominiums in our state and now he's spreading to California, Arizona, and all over, and he hasn't had a formal education; he's not an architect. But he's designed a unit of housing that's so complete, priced right, that he just can't get enough of them built all the time. And he has to have an architect as a friend so that it can pass our code, but yet he's designed it. And he was Chairman, and he told the story about vocational education and of every legislator -- every legislature -- we had him in the open sessions of the Senate and the open sessions of the House, and so I'm saying to you, all of these are available to you. In Utah we spend 52% of our budget for public education; 21% for higher education -- that's

nearly 75% -- it's 73% -- and our budget for our small state of a million people is$750 million -- three quarters of a billion dollars -- and that's how we're dedicated to education. But what we've got to start doing is doing what we've started a trend on and what Representative Lipton was talking about, is starting to put the thrust more to vocational education.

We have a syndrome in Utah -- it's known as the "Glory of God is Intelligence," and we think every child should go to the University of Utah or a university, four year school, be a university graduate. What do we have in statistics? For every student that starts in the freshman class in these institutions, we have from a third to a half of a student coming out the other end of the pipeline. The dropout rate scares you. It scares me as a legislator. And the reason is that we haven't in the secondary given our children a skill that they can use, and this is what this good fellow was talking about. We should give him a good skill. And the only way it's going to happen is if you people sitting here in this room get excited enough about it to excite your legislators. Forget Congress. You're on the home front. But I'm sure in your state that it's maybe not 10 to 1, maybe it's 15 to 1, but that's where the dollars are, so let's start mining those state gold dollars and putting into being the ideas that you have, and I'm sure we'll have a greater system.

You know, the only way, as I say, you get results, is to get excited. When I heard you all come back when someone said to you -- our Chairman, who said 'Good morning,' you all came back 'Good morning.' Are you still excited? Good morning!

All right. Now, let's go home and do something about it. You know we have in this country -- and I've used the word syndrome on a couple of

occasions and I'm going to use it again -- we have a meeting syndrome. All we do is come and meet, we exchange ideas, and we go home, and we have all these notes, but immediately when we sit down with all these notes, the phone rings, and we get our attention distracted, and we got to go to another meeting, and nothing happens. Now, I've said to you 'good morning.' How many of you will go home and do something about it? Raise your hands. That's great. Let's do that.

Thank you very much.

* * *

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1 - 2, 1975
Washington, D. C.

REMARKS OF MS. JEAN B. PURVIS
Chairman

Pennsylvania State Advisory Council on Vocational Education

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE MEETING
May 1-2, 1975

May 1, 1975

Mrs. Jean B. Purvis, Chairman
Pennsylvania State Advisory Council on Vocational Education

NOTE: The following is not the verbatim speech given by Mrs. Purvis but a copy of the notes from which she gave her presentation.

State Set-Up

Secretary of Education . . . Appointed by the Governor.

Under him, a Commissioner for Basic Education and a

Commissioner for Higher Education.

The Bureau for Vocational Education comes under the jurisdiction of Basic Education.

Pennsylvania SACVE recommended to the Secretary that a Commissioner for Vocational Education be appointed to coordinate all vocational programs. To be responsible directly to the Secretary. This has not been done, though the Secretary did designate a person to act as liaison for vocational education for the State Board and also the SACVE.

State Board of Education appointed for six-year terms by the Governor. Along with the Secretary, responsible for policy decisions, rules and regulations. State Board is divided into the Council for Basic Ed and Council for Higher Education. The Vocational Committee is made up of representatives from both Basic and Higher Education. This Committee reviews, policies and regulations in voc ed, and makes recommendations to the State Board for Vocational Education, which is the State Board wearing its vocational hat.

TITLE X

In April, 1974, the State Board of Education requested that membership on the State Post-Secondary Planning Commission (otherwise known as the 1202 Commission) be comprised of the nine members of the Council for Higher Education plus a representative from the Council for Basic Education, a representative from each of the six segments of the Advisory Committee on Planning, and one member from the SACVE. The SACVE representative is also a vocational director. We, however, have another member of our Council serving on the Commission in his capacity as President of one of the state colleges.

The first active responsibility of the Commission was to review the recommendations of the Task Force which had been appointed to recommend orderly development of two-year post-secondary programs to meet Pennsylvania's needs, to identify the most effective means of providing such programs at the two-year level, a method of financing them, and to suggest means for avoiding costly duplication of programs.

This study is now being evaluated by an Ad Hoc Committee of the Council and recommendations and evaluation of it will be a part of our 1975 Evaluation Report. So far the planning has all been post-secondary.

TITLE IX

On November 9, 1974, the State Board, acting upon its commitment to equal opportunity, announced its intent to pass an amendment requiring that the provision of vocational education be without regard for sex, race, religious preference, academic achievement, mental ability, or physical characteristics which do not endanger safety. This will be finally acted upon at the May 7th meeting.

The Penna. SACVE held five regional hearings during 1974...at all these hearings leaders in business and industry asked that women be encouraged actively to enter non-traditional areas, since those companies involved in affirmative action plans were having great difficulty finding trained women to fill the positions open.

In addition, representatives from NOW testified at each of the hearings. They had in each area visited local voc-tech schools, interviewing students, instructors, and directors. They found that though, for the most part, directors professed a commitment to equality of opportunity there did exist a pattern of discrimination in practice, if not in intent. This is part of the total discrimination problem due to a variety of factors:

1. Parental attitudes

2. Counselors who tend to channel girls into traditionally female fields, such as health services and cosmetology.

3. Instructors in traditionally male areas who made class experience difficult for girls. . .or permitted and encouraged male students to do so.

The NOW representatives asked that some sort of affirmative action plan for vocational education be adopted to recruit females into non-traditional areas.

The Bureau has already collected samples of brochures and booklets from the vocational schools in the state and plans to check them for sex stereotyping, in implication as well as statement. Once the amendment is passed, a meeting with members of the VAP is planned to design methods of dealing with such problems as I have mentioned. One suggestion was that of in-service training for all vocational education staff members in the various schools.

However. . . the President of VICA in Pennsylvania this past year was a most attractive and articulate senior welding student, so some barriers at least are being broken. Though this sounds like token compliance, perhaps today's tokenism is tomorrow's standard practice.

GAO REPORT

This is neither the time nor the place for me to respond in detail to the GAO Report. In any event, it has been dealt with by NACVE and others far better than I am able to. However, in discussing State administration, it is important that I explain very specifically how misleading some of the findings in the Report are, giving rise to most unfortunately damaging headlines, since Pennsylvania was one of the seven states surveyed.

I should like to preface this with a plea for some standardization and definition of statistical criteria. The numerous studies that come out use a variety of reporting methods which are usually not explained, thus making any kind of logical comparison very difficult.

There are a number of instances in the GAO Report where the conclusions are suspect because the kinds of data used are nowhere spelled out. For instance: the GAO reports a low ratio of program completions to student enrollments, implying this is true in all seven states studied. However, states differ in their definitions of vocational students. Some states include enrollments seven through twelve, some nine through twelve. The ratio of completions differs with state practice. In Pennsylvania most job-oriented curricula are three years. . .though there are some one and two year programs. Consequently we include only students ten through twelve, and our completion ratio was almost exactly one-third the total enrollment, a very high ration. In this connection also, it is not clear whether the GAO compared TOTAL enrollments, which include home economics with the follow-up, which does not. You can see what a maze this can lead us into.

But my specific concern today is the Report as it related to state administration, and there are several points on this I want to make. Number one is that nowhere in the VEA of 1968 was any attempt made to spell out any percentage of Federal funds to be used for state administration. There were no limitations at all. In fact, the reverse, since the language of the act specifically relates management functions for which Federal funds may and in some instances are encouraged to be used.

The Report says, "State Directors of vocational education told us that there was strong leadership at the state level because Federal funds have been available for this purpose and that such leadership would not be possible in many states without Federal funds." I concur. As a local school board member I am well aware of the many pressures in the State Legislature by special interest groups fighting for the State's dollar. In its traditional role as stepchild to basic and higher education. . . A role that has certainly changed in the last few years. . . vocational education would have had great problems setting up any kind of strong leadership with state funds.

When we discuss actual costs of administration there is still another point to be made: we need to make a distinction between administration per se and those services which can better be described as Management Services. . .they are services which directly affect the quality and extent of programs provided by local educational agencies, as well as their effectiveness. These ancillary services which are provided... Incidentally most of them mandated in some form by the VEA of 1968.

The VEA of 1968 include:

1. A statewide vocational education management information system (VEMIS). This is a computerized system which collects, analyses, interprets, classifies, and reports data on students, teachers, facilities, and curricula. (In 1972) Project Baseline called this one of the most complete, most relaible and most useful vocational education systems in the United States.)

2. A statewide follow-up survey conducted with graduates in the field following completion of their training. (This is also supplied by VEMIS.) Individual school reports based on the survey findings are distributed to all schools included in the system, as well as printouts listing all graduates found to be unemployed at the time of the survey.

3. Program evaluation in the field.

4. A statewide computer assisted placement service. This is provided to all schools and employers in the state. Employers are surveyed to find out their requirements for entry-level workers; the results are matched with a survey of prospective graduates career plans, then cap-o-grams are sent to employers listing students who will soon complete their occupational training and will be seeking full-time employment in the fields in which the employer has expressed an interest.

5. Also, of course, salaries for those who approve and monitor special programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, and for those who approve and monitor cooperative and work-study programs.

These are by no means all of the services provided through the state offices to the local educational agencies. Surely these are by any definition direct services to employers, program development and students. They are not strictly administrative in the somewhat pejorative sense of the Report, but are, rather, a part of sound management practice.

Thus, part of the funds the GAO Report says were retained at the State level were, in fact, channeled out into the field in these ancillary services.

Furthermore, the Report calculated the percentage spent on administration. . .on total State services. . .against Part B funds only. This does not in fact result in any kind of fair calculation since the State is responsible for managing the ENTIRE program for ALL parts of the Act, including Parts A, C, D, F and G in addition to B. Surely a sounder measurement would have included the total Federal funds for all these programs.

Pennsylvania's costs for programs to support ALL management functions under all parts of the Act amounted to $4,741,581. Calculated against the total Federal funding, including all parts of the Act, this percentage would be 15.9%.

But of this amount only $2,199,270 was expended at the State level. The rest was spent in the ancillary management services I have already described. . .the placement system, monitoring, management information system, field service in evaluations. All those functions, in fact, which result in direct services to local education

agencies, and which fulfill Federal requirements. When this two million is subtracted out, the total administrative costs. . .that is, of money retained at the state level. . .amount to 7.8%. That is hardly an inflated or unrealistic figure in view of the evaluative and monitoring requirements of the VEA. Total vocational funds - $169.1 million; administrative costs - 1.7%.

An additional criticism made was that the proportion of Federal funds used for "administrative type activities" is increasing. This is certainly true, since Federal funding has not increased in realistic proportion to the additional responsibilities given the State governments by Federal legislation, USOE guidelines, and audit recommendations. We all dream of perfect accountability, and certainly strive to achieve it, but it is simply not realistic in an economy of rising costs to demand more planning, more evaluation, more data, and more accountability for the same amount of money. . .which, with inflation, is not the same, but less. Duties and responsibilities of State governments are constantly increasing by one Federal fiat or another. . .but without additional funding to help support them.

And many of the recommendations in the Report. . .certainly excellent ones with which we agree. . .if adopted will further increase expenditures on the State level.

Incidentally, Pennsylvania has always carried a good ratio of State and local funds for every Federal dollar. . .in 1970 Pennsylvania expended $6.55 in State and local funds for each Federal dollar and by 1973 this support had risen to $7.08.

The Report stresses the need for more systematic, coordinated comprehensive planning to improve the use of Federal funds and to better insure that vocational education is provided in a manner that best serves student and community needs.

No one would want to argue with this or with the contention that in the past State plans have rarely served this kind of purpose. Advisory councils have long been concerned that State plans include realistic long and short range goals based on demonstrable need. In Pennsylvania our VEMIS and computer assisted placement systems have resulted in much planning improvement. We are now getting the kind of data we need to project needs more realistically and solidly. Furthermore more active involvement of all concerned agencies. . .advisory council, vocational administrators, Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, etc. . . should result in a truly workable State plan.

However, sound State planning, evaluation, and needs assessment. . .all the requirements for truly effective vocational education. . .cannot go on in isolation. Strong national leadership, monitoring and centralization of data are needed as well.

Right now this just doesn't happen. As the Report pointed out, the Office of Education is simply not able to provide the kind of monitoring needed because of limited staff. Actually the State directors have been unable to get any of the strong central leadership that is needed. One director compared it to CETA...like the prime sponsors, each going his own way, vocational education is becoming fragmented, with each State pursuing its own path. Fortunately, to try to fill the gap, the State Directors' Association and the AVA have been meeting regularly, on both regional and national levels. Pennsylvania belongs to a six State region and these directors meet for idea exchanges and reports. But this is no substitute for strong Federal leadership.

You can understand the desperate lack of staffing when I explain that in the USOE Regional Office - which is supposed to service six states - there are three people. . .all with less experience than most of the people on Pennsylvania's State staff.

It is ironic that the Report complains of the use of Federal money for State administration when, in practice, it is this that has meant the development of strong State leadership. If our State leadership had been as poorly supported as our Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, vocational education would not have made the tremendous gains we have seen since 1968.

We can all hope that the Congress of The United States, without depriving the States of the strong leadership that has accounted for so much of the successful implementation of the VEA, will provide sufficient funding for the Office of Education to assume its proper leadership role, with the sound management, comprehensive needs assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation we must have if we are to be successful working partners in the effort to provide functional and accountable instructional programs at all levels of education.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1 - 2, 1975

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROMAN PUCINSKI

Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1-2, 1975

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROMAN PUCINSKI

Luncheon - May 1, 1975

Introduction by Mr. Donald N. McDowell

I'm very pleased to be here. As you know, Bob Semerad was going to address you this noon, at this luncheon, and I'm not quite sure what the reason was, but Bob couldn't be here. So I was asked if I would share with you some of my views on this subject -- some of the legislative proposals that we have pending, and other things that we may want to talk about.

I accepted this invitation with real pleasure because it gives me a chance to talk to that group of men and women whom I honestly believe can turn around this Nation's educational system as America goes into her third Century.

I sponsored the Amendments that gave birth to the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and the State Advisory Councils

and looking over the work that you have done -- looking over the analysis which you all have in your folders, and looking over the State Plans, looking over the work that's being done all over this country in vocational education -- I must tell you if I never did another thing in my life, I'd be proud of the job you ladies and gentlemen are doing. I am pleased to be a Member of the National Advisory Council because it has a very distinguished group of citizens from across this country who truly reflect a cross section of America, and who have an abiding interest in making vocational education work in this country. I'm impressed with the manner in which the Members of the National Advisory Council approach their responsibility. They're all busy people. They all have responsibilities in their respective communities. Our Chairman is an Executive of the Whirlpool Corporation. They're having a lot of problems, as is every company in America today, in trying to adjust to the changing conditions. And yet, he finds time -- he makes time -- to provide leadership for the Council itself. And I can say this for every Member on the Council. This is not just another Advisory Council. They tell me there are 167 Presidential Commissions. I can honestly state -- having watched the Washington scene for many, many years -- that the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education is probably the hardest working of most Commissions. Now, the National Council is here to serve you. And I am pleased, also -- in looking at the State Councils, I was a little disappointed this morning, I must say, when Jack had his impromptu survey, and asked many of you how many of you had sent your children to college, and most of you raised your hands -- then he said how many of you had sent your children to vocational schools, and there was a relatively

small showing of hands -- I would hope that the fact that you have not had the actual experience of sending your own children to vocational school would not in any way temper your deep dedication to the opportunities that lie ahead for this country as we surge to a third century.

But the fact of the matter is, that for a long, long time in this country, more than a hundred years, we have supported a sort of elitest school system which really trained millions upon millions of young Americans to do nothing. And the day after the youngster got his high school diploma, and Ma and Pa were very proud -- the lump in their throats when they saw their youngster out there on that stage getting that diploma -- and when Monday came along, and the youngster had to go to work, or face the world of work -- if he wasn't going on to college -- it suddenly dawned on them that they've got a fine youngster, totally unprepared for the world of work. And so I have to agree -- very enthusiastically -- with the Presidential Commission findings of 1971, the Presidential Commission on Education -- which recommended that we bury -- and that was their word, not mine -- that we bury the general education curriculum, and put vocational education and college preparation on a completely co-equal basis. They recognized the needs of America. They recognized that we are the most industrialized Nation in the world. No other Nation in this world can even come close to the fantastic industrial expansion of America. And yet we continue to treat vocational education, as Marv Feldman said in 1962, I believe, as a step child. Totally illogical, totally indefensible, and we're not paying the price. We have -- indeed, we have to turn the system around. They tell us that we have to train the total person. The educators have said now, don't fool around with vocational education or

anything else. Just train the total person, and when you have done that, that total person will then find his or her level in society. Well, we're paying the price for that today. I saw a story in the National Observer the other day on how vandalism in this country is reaching new heights and becoming the number one problem in this Nation. We have millions of young people being lured into all sorts of things they shouldn't be lured into simply because these young people have been unprepared for any meaningful role in life. College dropout, in my judgment, is the most serious social problem of America. We have a school system that carefully trains a youngster for twelve years to go to college. And then when that youngster drops out, as eighty percent of them do, he's totally unprepared for the world of work; in many instances doesn't even know how to apply for a job.

I could spend the rest of this afternoon making a case on why we ought to give the college-bound student the highest emphasis on vocational education. But there are very few Americans left who can send their youngster through college without the youngster having some kind of a job to help pay the way. And doesn't it make more sense that this college-bound youngster have some sort of a skill to take with him, and have some sort of a decent job between the time he enters college and the time he gets his degree and starts his career in the profession, rather than have him take the worst paying jobs because he has no skill at all?

So one could argue very effectively that this whole business of saying well, these youngsters are going to college and they don't need any kind of skill training, and these youngsters are not going to be doing very much so we give them a general education training, and then somehow

or other, by some magic formula, we single out X-number of youngsters for a vocational education, in my judgment is indefensible. And this is why it seems to me that you, ladies and gentlemen, as members of the State Advisory Councils, have the greatest responsibility in this country. No one has a greater responsibility in re-shaping the American educational system than you do. And I think you ought to recognize what lies ahead.

I know that you are worried -- and I am worried -- about the eight and a half million people unemployed in this country today. It's true that we have a very serious unemployment problem. And no one wants to, in any way, minimize that problem. The fact of the matter is that we have 87 million people employed. And the fact of the matter is that this Nation will work its way out of this economic valley as we have from previous economic valleys. Those of you who have any familiarity with America's economic profile of the last one hundred years will find that this Nation has had a series of hills and valleys. And some hills are higher. In the decade of the '60s we had ten years of unprecedented economic growth in this country, an unemployment rate of 2.5 percent. Now, we have an 8 percent-9 percent unemployment rate and we're deeper in the valley than we want to be. But the fact of the matter is as you look at this profile of the hills and valleys, we work our way out of them. And when we work our way out of this one, and I'm absolutely certain that we will -- don't you worry about that -- some people look upon America as if it's falling apart. This country has had many, many problems. There were also those who did not think the American Revolution would succeed -- and it almost didn't, if you read the desperate letters of George Washington to the Continental Congress; and the Civil War --

there were those who said it's all over. And then the great depression of the '30's, and Pearl Harbor. People said, my God, it's all over. The assassination of Kennedy. The transition of the President. We've gone through many shocks in this country. But this Nation's going to work it's way out, and when it does, that's where you come in. Because once we work our way out of this valley, this Nation is moving to a two trillion dollar economy. Such huge economic growth that it boggles the imagination. And it's all there, except one thing. The only thing that can threaten the future of this country is a lack of skilled men and women power to run the industries. And that's why you have been established. The SACVE's, the State Advisory Councils, were created in response to a massive failure of our educational system to prepare young people for real job opportunities. The State Advisory Councils were created to provide change in a system which is traditionally slow to accept change. That's why you were created. And I was there. And I can tell you what was the intent of Congress, because I was the Chairman of the Committee. Let's spell out that intent.

You were created to bring about systematic change to a system that refused to change. And we gave you broad powers. Extraordinary powers. We had given you powers that no other Advisory Council has. We wrote into this bill setting up the State Advisory Councils that they are to be totally and wholly independent of the existing system. And they needed to be more than just advisory. The federal legislation mandates -- spells it out -- mandates, the independence of these Councils. It gives them clear, and permittable powers. Their oversight responsibilities are specifically spelled out in the law. You are not just

another advisory group, a group of nice citizens who've been called together as some sort of a political cosmetic. Your responsibilities are spelled out. As a matter of fact, you can be held accountable for failure to carry out those responsibilities.

And I'm grateful to Bob Brigham from Nevada, because Bob had asked for a definition of the responsibilities, the legal responsibilities of State Councils. And I think that all of you ought to share in that responsibility. Because, unlike many other advisory councils, the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education can cut off Federal educational funds by refusing to certify a State Plan. Public Law 95-76 is very clear on this point. Section 102-31, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended in '68, provides clearly and specifically that a State Plan can be submitted to the U. S. Commissioner of Education "only if the State Board has prepared the State Plan or amendments thereto in consultation with the State Advisory Council pursuant to sub-paragraph two of this subparagraph." And sub-paragraph two reads as follows: "Consultation with State Advisory Council: The State Plan for each fiscal year, and any amendments thereto required by paragraph C of this section, shall be accompanied by statement of the State Advisory Council certifying that the State Plan or amendment was prepared in consultation with the Council." And paragraph C of Section 102-31 above provides that any amendments to any vocational education program under the State Plan can be made by the State Board only after consultation with the State Advisory Council, U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Vocational Adult Education, which administers Federal aid programs to vocational education and approves or disapproves State Plans, has applied the conventional definition to the words "in

consultation." "A State Advisory Council shall play a full role during the entire"-- and I underscore --"the entire process of planning and developing a State Plan for vocational education," instead of merely a pro-forma role of perfunctory approval after development by the State Board.

Now this does not mean that a State Board can develop a State Plan and then merely submit it to you and say, here, sign it. This means that you have to be in on the action from beginning to end. And your input is clearly spelled out in the law. As a matter of fact, to show you how thoroughly independent the Congress wants you to be in providing that new dimension of leadership that is so urgently necessary in American education, the Senate Committee went further in their report and stated, in 1970, "the operation of the State Advisory Council which was first required by the Amendments of 1968, is of great concern to the Committee. First, the Committee concedes the State Councils as an essential source of new expertise on the development of new vocational programs. And the more effective re-direction of existing programs to greater relevancy. Second, the Committee believes these councils should be independent evaluators of the effectiveness of programs within the States and independent commentators of the advisability of the provisions of the State Plan. This independence, especially from the State Department of Education, is essential if the Councils are to make sound objective judgments. Therefore, the Committee is very concerned with the presence of State Directors of Vocational Education on several Councils, and the use of State Department personnel by other councils, seriously erodes the effectiveness of these Councils. The Committee, accordingly,

urges the Office of Education to review the operation of all State Councils and require that State Directors be excluded from membership, and that funds appropriated for the Councils go directly to the Councils from the Office of Education to be used at the sole direction of the Councils in the employment of staff and for the evaluation of studies."

Now this does not mean that there should be a state of hostility between the State Advisory Council or the responsible school officers of that state. On the contrary. This is urging you to have a close cooperation. But the fact of the matter is that school administrators and school boards and school boards of regents and state educational institutions, and everybody else in that State has to recognize you as that mechanism created by the Congress of the United States to bring to your state a program of relevant education for the young people of your community. And I tell you it's an awesome responsibility. Leadership is always a difficult task. Leadership -- as Jack will find out as he becomes the Chairman of this Council -- is a lonely job. You have to make tough decisions. And sometimes, you're going to be criticized. And you're going to have a lot of obstacles put in your way. And there are going to be people who're going to say they can do it better. And there will be people who will maybe even ridicule some of your suggestions. But you have been placed on the State Advisory Council because the law says that we want expertise that you can bring to this field. And I hope that somewhere along the line each one in this room, attending this conference, will ponder for a moment who you are, and what great role of responsibility you have for the future of the American educational system. And I'll tell you right now, if you fail, we all fail.

For the needs are going to be great. We have on the National Advisory Council prepared a series of legislative proposals which are designed to strengthen your activities, and strengthen your ability to deliver on the high hopes that the Congress has placed in your hands.

Looking at our State Reports, the reports that you have filed, we have tried to pull out the things that you need to make yourself more effective. And most of the recommendations that we have submitted to both the House and the Senate reflect, to a great extent, the concerns that you have expressed in your annual reports. And I want to tell you, I am proud of the high quality of those reports. It indicates to me that the Congress was on the right track when it created the State Advisory Councils in 1968. As a matter of fact, many of them, I can tell you honestly, have surpassed my own expectations. And many of you have brought an expertise to your work that makes me very proud. Some of the recommendations, and you have all of the recommendations in your kit, -- first of all, we're recommending that the 1968 Amendments be continued without major change. We feel that to make any major changes in the '68 Act would trigger off another long process of guidelines and reports and the long debates -- and I don't like to fool around with a system that's working. And it appears to me that the '68 Amendments are working, and you're helping make them work. And so we're suggesting that basically the '68 Vocational Act should be extended for at least another five years.

In our statement that no more than 30 percent of federal funds should be used for maintenance of effort without justification by the State Plan, the reason for that is a very simple one. Federal funds were never intended to finance existing programs. Federal funds are primarily

intended as the cutting edge for new ventures, new experiments, for which it cannot get state funds or perhaps don't want to use state funds. And so while we recognize that the failure of using federal funds for some on-going programs might seriously curtail those programs, that's why we didn't set this proposal in concrete. We said we suggest that no more than 30 percent be used for on-going programs and maintenance of effort. But if there is some special reason that more has to be used, go ahead and do it. But merely state in your plans why you were doing it. So that there would be an awareness of the fact that there was some special reason. There was some discussion this morning about any vocational education funds for counseling should be used specifically for training of counselors in areas related to vocational education, and one of the participants said that this can't be done. We think that one of the great problems -- and nobody is a greater champion of counseling than Roman Pucinski -- I wrote into the 1972 Occupational Act a provision for training guidance counselors at the sixth grade level because we found that the genesis of a dropout begins more or less at the sixth grade level. And we place such high priority and such high trust, and such high hopes on counseling and guidance officers that we said we want you to start at the sixth grade level. But we do think that in many instances, counselors and guidance officers are not properly trained in vocational guidance. And so what we're saying is use these vocational funds to help improve the expertise of the counselors so that they can give these youngsters some practical, meaningful, realistic guidance in the opportunities that lie ahead. We have no conflict with the lady's statement that the two are very closely knit. Of course they are. What

we're suggesting is that we add another dimension to the already effective work of counseling and guidance. We said also the plans should assess in detail efforts of coordination between CETA and vocational education. This is your biggest challenge. And we hope that as State Advisory Councils, you will react as is the Chairman, and Don, and all the others on the National Council, for CETA has a great opportunity for all of us. CETA was very carefully designed by the Congress not to make the mistakes of WPA and PWA, where we hired people helter, skelter, and gave them make-busy projects, just to give them a paycheck. CETA recognized the fact that in this Nation, that many of the people -- many, many of the people -- who are now layed off, are never going to go back to their original job because the whole industry is changing, and the people in the automobile industry are never going to be rehired, all of them, because new techniques are being put in. And so CETA is designed to have a vocational component, so that when these people do re-enter the labor market, they will be able to re-enter with a new skill. It won't hurt them to have a fall-back position, even if they are called back to their original jobs. Every citizen ought to have some sort of a fall-back position. And so these are the things that we're recommending -- as I said, we wanted to cover all of the points because you've got them in your folder -- if you have some very specific questions, we'll be very happy to answer them.

The fact of the matter is that you have a great responsibility. Now, I'm sick and tired of people telling me that vocational education is too expensive. That's absolute nonsense. Nobody ever questions the millions of dollars -- the billions of dollars -- that are spent in this

country on carefully training a youngster for college, for twelve years, and then when he drops out six months after college, nobody says that you've wasted twelve years of educational facilities on this youngster. I think that of all the educational programs we have, the most productive is vocational education. Sure, it's expensive at times. One of the things that we had to look at in vocational education is instead of having mass courses, we had designed -- developed, rather -- five thousand new job skills in America in the last decade. Now, maybe the job opportunities are not too great for each of these skills, but you as vocational education proponents will have to develop the curriculum. And don't be afraid if that curriculum is going to serve a relatively small segment of your community. And don't be afraid that GAO is going to come around later and say that you're spending too much money. With all due respect to GAO, they're just another agency of government.

I was telling Mr. Ahart that I respected their study because he's like an artist -- that's the way he sees the vocational education program and we respect him for it. I was with a friend recently, and an artist was painting a portrait of him, and my friend didn't think it was a pretty good job. I didn't think so either. But I said, you know, that portrait gives you some idea of how the artist sees you. Now, if you want to see how you see yourself, take a photograph. But a painting gives you an idea of how that artist sees you, and that's how GAO sees us. And they've been helpful, in many respects, in some things; you know there are some parts of the GAO report that I figure somebody who didn't know what vocational education was all about wrote that part. But that's okay. We said to Congress yesterday we accept it for what it's

worth. It's a guideline to us. So don't be harrassed by threats that every time you make a mistake, GAO is going to be on your back. As a matter of fact, I propose that we give you a 'mulligan,' everyone of you. You know what a 'mulligan' in golf is? When you have a bad shot, you don't count it, see. And I propose we give everyone of you -- as members of SACVE's -- one mulligan a year. Make a mistake. Nobody'll hang you for it. But at least if you make mistakes, there's great opportunities; great opportunities for this country -- in police sciences, in paramedics, in agribusiness. Don, over here, is right. Some people are ready to write off the ag schools -- nonsense. They have yet to see their greatest glory as we try to see how we're going to feed a whole world, ocean harvesting -- all the other exciting things that are happening in agriculture; great opportunities there. In the distributive sciences. The challenge in training women -- here is where you, as members of State Advisory Councils might take a hard look for we anticipate that by 1990, the female population of the American labor force is going to exceed the male population. The population of this country now exceeds -- there's 51 percent females and 49 percent males. We anticipate by 1980 it's going to be 53-47. So you're going to have to train -- not because of some sentimental reasons in the women's lib or something. You're going to have to be a great deal more pragmatic. You're going to have to recognize that you have to restructure your educational courses to train women for the world of work as bread winners, and at the same time for that historic role as homemakers.

And so these are the challenges that lie ahead. And I'm

going to tell you this -- no other citizen in this country has a responsibility more than those of you in this room. This country is going to need your expertise. As we surge to this enormous economic growth, vocational education is going to make the difference between our success and our failure. And I'd like to point this out. When a doctor makes a mistake, he buries it, and nobody ever knows the difference. When a lawyer makes a mistake, he appeals it -- tells his client the judge doesn't know the law. But when educators make a mistake, the scars follow the child -- perhaps for the rest of his life. No segment of our society has a more awesome responsibility than those of you in education for you're dealing with human beings. And the program that you effectuate as a leading source of vocational education in your respective states are going to make the difference between success and failure. Jack Kennedy wrote a book about profiles in courage -- the amount of courage that you show in recognizing the enormous responsibility and the opportunities can very well be your own chapter. I hope that before you leave this conference, somewhere in the quiet and solitude of your own thinking, you will assess your own position in the scheme of things. This is a big country -- 200 million of us -- and yet in this room are the people who can turn it around. And I hope before you go home, you'll assess your opportunity, your responsibility. Then when you get home, sit down with your family and tell them who you are, and tell them what you're doing, and tell them what you hope to do. And tell them that with your effort, and their help, yes, we can turn the American education system around. I'll tell you this -- if you fail, we all fail.

Thank you.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1 - 2, 1975
Washington, D. C.

REMARKS BY GREGORY J. AHART, DIRECTOR

Manpower and Welfare Division
U. S. General Accounting Office

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE MEETING
May 1-2, 1975

REMARKS BY GREGORY J. AHART, Director
Manpower and Welfare Division
U.S. General Accounting Office

Thank you, and good afternoon Members of the National and State Advisory Councils.

The Comptroller General was pleased to receive your invitation to discuss the approach the General Accounting Office is taking to vocational education and, more specifically, our recent report to Congress titled "What Is The Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education?" Because GAO's Manpower and Welfare Division -- which I head -- was responsible for that study, and I testified on the report before the House and Senate Education Subcommittees, he asked me to represent him here today. This may be because he liked the testimony, or because he thought I needed a bit more exposure to heat and kitchens. In any event, I hope my remarks will trigger some good questions for discussion.

I want to put this talk in the context of "Challenge for Vocational Education," rather than "Challenge to Vocational Education." True enough, the press coverage of our recent report could lead one to feel that we were throwing down a challenge "to" the content, practitioners, and administration of vocational education and had, in fact, mounted an attack on it.

In the context of your efforts, however, one of GAO's purposes in looking at the federally assisted vocational education program was very similar to that of the National and State Advisory Councils:

> To identify problem areas and systemic weaknesses in program delivery, and to make constructive suggestions for improvement so that the greatest benefit for the largest number of people is achieved.

In general, the GAO looks at the full range of activity in the Executive Branch itself and federally supported activity at the State and local levels. The key question is always one of checking results and trends against what can generally be agreed to as the intent of Congress. Let's take a moment to review the evolution of this function.

ROLE OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

In 1921, Congress established the General Accounting Office (GAO), headed by the Comptroller General, to assess how the Federal agencies -- through their programs and activities -- carry out the mandate or the intent of Congress. GAO's method of operation has evolved considerably during its fifty year history to keep pace with the changes in scope and philosophy of Federal activities, such as those in education.

Initially, GAO performed its audit work almost entirely in Washington, D. C., with major emphasis on detecting errors in bookkeeping, or illegal expenditures. Later, it made audits where records were kept, and instead of limiting its concern to vouchers and contracts, began making studies of needed management improvements and examining how programs were carried out. The general premise adopted for audit purposes was that achievement of efficient, economical, and effective operation was basically a responsibility of agency management.

GAO has been able to develop a comprehensive audit approach -- that is, it has gone beyond the legality and propriety of expenditures and fiscal accountability, generally. It is concerned also with management accountability, and with program accountability. Fiscal reviews are made to determine whether the law, regulations, and other criteria are being adhered to. Management accountability concerns whether Federal funds and other resources are being efficiently and economically managed. Program accountability concerns whether the programs are effective in achieving the objectives intended by Congress, and whether alternative approaches have been examined that might accomplish the objectives more effectively or more economically.

The interest of Congress in having GAO emphasize program accountability was spelled out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That Act provides that GAO review and analyze the results of government programs and activities carried out under existing law, including the making of cost-benefit studies, when requested by either House of Congress, or by any of its Committees, or upon its own initiative. GAO believes that one of its most important means of providing assistance to Congress is the reports that are issued on the results of its independent audits and reviews.

GAO employs a professional staff of about 3,000. Staff members are assigned to GAO's Central Office in Washington, D. C., its regional offices located throughout the United States, and its overseas offices. The number of staff from disciplines other than accounting is growing; they come from fields such as law, business management, engineering, mathematics, political science, and systems analysis. In the Manpower and Welfare Division, we have staff with doctorates and experience in medicine, psychology, and education.

Because of increasing Federal expenditure in the field of education, as well as Congressional and public interest, GAO in recent years has allocated greater resources to reviewing federally assisted education programs. Most of GAO's work in education has focused on programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act. With Congressional oversight, and revision of the vocational legislation anticipated in fiscal year 1975, GAO looked at vocational education programs, and in December, 1974, issued its report.

In the course of our review, we undertook to assess progress in implementing the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. This included study of reports prepared by the National and selected State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, which had been mandated by that legislation. As noted in our report, "councils were aware of, and had reported on, many significant problems in vocational education." In fact, many of the problem areas described in our report were documented earlier by these coundils. A 1974 summary compiled by the National Council from State Council responses to a comprehensive questionnaire were particularly helpful, because it highlighted areas of concern common to many State Councils.

Moving on, now, to GAO's report, I would like to present a brief overview and discuss implications for Advisory Councils.

GAO REPORT

To evaluate the vocational education program as it relates to the expenditure of Federal funds, we reviewed implementation of the program -- primarily that supported under Part B -- at national, regional, State and local levels. In the context of our national survey we concentrated our detailed review on programs in seven States -- California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Washington -- which, together, spent some thirty percent of the total Federal funds spent for the program in fiscal year 1973. Our study sought answers to the following questions:

- What role does the Federal dollar play?
- How is vocational education planned?
- How are Federal vocational funds distributed?
- How are training resources used?
- Is training related to employment?

Because of the shortness of time today, and the fact that all of you have the opportunity to read the report in its entirety, I will focus on our recommendations to Congress, and to the Secretary of HEW.

1. What role does the Federal dollar play?

VEA's stated purpose and particular assurances required by the Act indicate the Congress intended Federal dollars be used as seed money to stimulate State efforts so that more people would receive occupational preparation to meet national manpower needs. Federal funds then would be available at the local level to extend, develop, and improve vocational opportunities. However, VEA also permits States to use Federal funds to maintain existing vocational programs.

Because large amounts of Federal funds have been retained at the State level for administrative purposes, we recommended that Congress consider setting a limit on that amount, as provided in other Federal education legislation, so that these funds can be made available for direct services to program participants at the local level. We recently noted that one State Advisory Council -- a State we did not visit -- addressed this issue in its Annual Report issued in 1975.

Because funds available for expenditure at the local level in many instances have been used for existing activities, rather than primarily to support new program initiatives, we recommended that Congress consider requiring that Federal funds be used primarily to develop and improve programs and extend vocational opportunities by limiting the amount that can be used to maintain existing activities. This is an area in which we think State Advisory Councils could play an important role. Rather than building on an existing plan and budget, Advisory Councils could urge States to realign the purposes for which Federal funds are used so that these funds can fulfill their "seed" function.

Persons with special needs -- the disadvantaged and the handicapped -- have not been given as high a priority with State and local support as with Federal support, and some States experience difficulty in spending the Federal set-asides for this purpose. We recommended several options for Congres to consider if it believes these two groups should receive priority attention in utilization of Federal funds. Your Councils have expressed concern about the still very small percentage of these students being served in terms of the numbers needing vocational education, and we would hope that you might accelerate your efforts to assure that appropriate provisions are made for these services.

Because neither OE nor the States we visited had determined what strategies and types of projects would produce the desired results of maximizing effectiveness of federally assisted programs, we recommended that the Secretary of HEW identify and accumulate data about strategies for providing vocational education that are catalytic and offer the greatest payoff, and that he review the use of Federal funds to insure that they serve the role intended by Congress. Advisory Councils need to emphasize this criterion in the planning for vocational education, and the conducting of evaluations.

2. How is Vocational Education planned?

Achievement of VEA objectives depends, to a large extent, on systematic, coordinated, and comprehensive planning at national, State, and local levels for the delivery of vocational education.

Because the vocational education program was not characterized by the kind of planning which would assure that vocational education is provided in a manner that best serves student and community needs, as your Advisory Councils also have observed, we recommended that Congress consider requiring States to use a portion of whatever Federal funds are retained at the State level to improve the planning process. State Advisory Councils, by involving themselves earlier and more significantly in the planning process, could help assure that plans constitute an effective tool for guiding and measuring performance, instead of being only compliance documents citing the necessary assurances to receive Federal funds.

Because organizational patterns at all levels tend to diffuse responsibility, and often result in uncoordinated and isolated planning for vocational education, we recommended that Congress consider requiring the Secretaries of HEW and the Department of Labor to establish a process for planning which would relate vocational education to the State Post-secondary Commissions authorized by the Education Amendments of 1972, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. Such a process should better assure that education and manpower efforts will be synchronized for students at all levels -- secondary, postsecondary, adult, Advisory Councils at all levels -- national, State, local -- could initiate and play an important part in this kind of coordinated planning.

We also made recommendations to HEW, which, if implemented, should improve the planning of vocational programs. Particular attention should be given to the recommendation which emphasizes needs assessment. Specifically, we recommended that the Secretary of HEW expand efforts to enforce the requirement that all local education agencies (LEA's) and State education agencies (SEA's) in planning vocational programs, identify the needs of public and private business, industry, labor, and students and that those needs be considered the primary basis for decision-making about provision of vocational services supported by VEA.

State Advisory Councils can exert a major leadership role with regard to assessment of need. By requiring that Councils include persons representative of the consumers of education -- management, labor, the general public -- as well as those familiar with the operations of vocational programs, and with special needs of the clientele -- Congress attempted to bring to bear the larger perspective of community and individual needs. Councils, through their ability to obtain community input, should assist in identifying high priority needs. They then should monitor development and implementation of State Plans to assure that funds are distributed and used in ways which address those priorities.

3. How are Federal vocational funds distributed?

VEA requires that States adhere to specific criteria in distributing PartB funds to insure that the most pressing needs for vocational education will be addressed within respective States. Many of the procedures by which States have distributed these funds, however, do not necessarily result in the funds being targeted to areas of highest need or to areas maximizing program impact. Some major practices noted in the States we visited were:

- Making funds available to all LEA's within the State, rather than concentrating funds in selected areas with high needs;
- Making funds available to LEA's without adequately identifying the need in relation to the needs in other areas;
- Making funds available without considering ability of LEA's to provide their own resources.

Because we believe the extent to which actual State practices entrance requirements in distribution of Federal funds corresponds to the law's criteria for distribution has a significant bearing on the extent on which the law's purposes are being achieved, we recommended that the Secretary of HEW analyze these practices. State Advisory Councils, in reviewing State Plans, should consider adequacy of State agency methods for distributing funds. Councils should assure consistency between these procedures and VEA criteria for distributing funds. Then, in performing their evaluation function, Councils should determine the effectiveness of the actual distribution process -- including the allocation of funds among the various levels -- secondary, post-secondary, adult.

4. How are training resources used?

To respond effectively to the steadily increasing need for vocational training, as envisioned by the Act, maximum consideration must be given to the use of all available training resources in the community and in the State. In recent years, competition for available funds -- and the unlikelihood of substantial additional funding -- have made all the more imperative full-scale cooperative efforts on the part of those charged with training.

Although we observed instances in which local officials had expanded the range of vocational offerings by using a variety of community-based facilities, in the States we visited, vocational education authorities often had not made full use of existing resources. We were told that community colleges, in particular, were not fully used, especially in the afternoon, and that there were opportunities for increased training. Frequently, school officials at the local level had not explored possibilities of using either other public school facilities, federally funded manpower skill centers, military installations, proprietary schools, or employer sites to expand or strenthen vocational program offerings.

Because we believe that public education agencies should explore potential sharing of other resources in the community -- particularly employer sites -- as well as take steps to maximize use of their own facilities -- we recommended that Congress consider establishing a set-aside requirement for cooperative arrangements under Part B to expand vocational offerings and strenthen programs through use of other public training facilities or non-public training resources.

Because about sixteen percent of Federal funds have been spent on construction, and this expenditure has not necessarily been contingent upon need for facilities, we recommended that Congress consider establishing a legislative policy, that Federal funds will not be used for construction except in instances in which there is adequate justification that additional facilities are needed after thorough consideration of alternatives, including use of other existing faciltities (employer sites, military installations, etc.). Advisory Councils can be helpful in assessing need for construction.

Our recommendations to the Secretary of HEW were based on the belief that expanded vocational opportunities and strengthened program offerings would result if OE and States would provide leadership in forging partnerships for using all resources, including those outside the technical vocational education pattern. Recommendations to which Advisory Councils should give particular attention are:

- Determining costs for alternative training strategies so that the most cost-effective approaches for providing training can be identified and utilized;
- Documenting in local applications and State Plans the nature and extent of cooperative efforts among those providing skill training so that duplication and gaps in the types of training offered can be avoided;
- Increasing flexibility in vocational training arrangements through such mechanisms as expansion of the present school day, week, or year, and inclusion of transportation costs, so that better use can be made of existing facilities;
- Identifying statutes and administrative procedures which may prevent schools from using other community training resources, and implementing plans for removing those obstacles.

State Advisory Councils, ideally reflecting in their membership a variety of facets of community enterprise, should play an influential role in identifying and marshalling the range of training resources. Through active efforts with their respective constituencies, Council Members can improve the use of available training resources -- facilities, equipment, personnel, curriculum -- thereby contributing to assuring that more types of training options are available and more persons who need training are able to participate.

5. Is training related to employment?

Although the Act requires that vocational training or retraining be realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, this factor generally has not been adequately considered in planning for vocational education, in distributing Federal funds, or in evaluating programs. As a result, large enrollments have persisted in program areas with only a limited relationship to labor market considerations, and there is little assurance that manpower needs in new and emerging occupations are being addressed.

Because of the importance of achieving a match between training and manpower needs, we recommended that Congress consider requiring that Federal vocational funds directed to LEA's for programs be used for those skill areas for which existing or anticipated job opportunities can be demonstrated. State Advisory Councils, through leadership in formulating guidelines for local Advisory Councils, could assure that their composition and role are clearly defined and structured. By providing technical assistance to these local Councils, and by monitoring and evaluating their performance, State Councils could help improve their capability to impact effectively on local vocational programs -- particularly in this area of matching training with job requirements.

Because inclusion of actual work experience in the curriculum provides students with real life exposure to work requirements and helps assure that they receive training appropriate to employer needs, we recommended that Congress consider requiring work experience as an integral component of Part B programs. State and local Advisory Councils could assist in identifying work experience opportunities and ways of integrating these experiences into the curriculum.

Since many students are not able to obtain employment in fields for which they are trained, we recommended that Congress consider requiring schools to take responsibility for job placement assistance and follow-up in federally supported vocational programs. Advisory Councils -- especially those Members from public and private business and industry and labor -- could help design strategies for the transition from school to work and for following students after they complete training.

Our recommendations to the Secretary of HEW, if implemented, should result in greater relevancy of vocational programs. Those recommendations address:

- Developing labor market data in a form which will better enable vocational planners at State and local levels to match occupational training with employment needs, and which will assist State and local Advisory Councils in evaluating the extent of match;

- Developing techniques for obtaining information from students and employers to assess the appropriateness and adequacy of training;

- Formulating and implementing strategies to eliminate or dissipate barriers which inhibit improvement or expansion of vocational programs (such as labor union opposition to work experience, teacher union opposition to instruction by non-certified persons), or barriers which restrict persons from fully participating (such as age, sex, etc.

Evaluations conducted by Advisory Councils at all levels -- national, State, local -- should be geared primarily to this crucial point:

Are vocational education programs arming America's young people and adults with the kind and level of skills necessary to function in today's and tomorrow's world? Are these programs meeting the priority needs both of individuals and communities? By authorizing separate funding for the National and State Councils. Congress sought to free them from reliance on the vocational establishment so that they could perform the vigorous, independent oversight of vocational education that would assist in assuring that these programs are achieving this purpose. We hope that you will continue to be vigilant in this pursuit.

Thank you for this opportunity to share with you the position we have taken about ways of improving vocational education and the role that Advisory Councils can play. I will be happy to respond to any questions.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE

Meeting

May 1 - 2, 1975
Washington, D. C.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CASPAR W. WEINBERGER

Secretary

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NACVE/SACVE MEETING
May 1-2-, 1975

REMARKS BY HONORABLE CASPAR W. WEINBERGER, Secretary
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare

I am pleased to join with you today to discuss the challenges to vocational education.

This is indeed a moment of high challenge. Our country has grown and prospered on work. The work ethic has been strong in America. It is the heritage we received from generations of immigrants who came here seeking work and opportunity. They made us a nation of doers and builders and the productive envy of the world -- until lately.

We now find ourselves in danger of being outproduced, out-hustled, and outworked by other nations -- Japan, West Germany, Russia.

We can look all about us and find reasons, but one reason is clear enough: We are not doing a very good job of introducing our young people to the world of work.

Right now, the country with the highest unemployment rate for youth in the world is America. Overall, it is almost 28 percent.

Surely, this is no way to teach the benefits of work to young Americans.

Our present economic troubles obviously have something to do with the high unemployment rate for young people. But you know, and I know that is not the whole story.

Unemployment among young people has ALWAYS been high. Other factors are therefore clearly at work -- and the symptoms are there for all to see:

- Guidance counselors are spending only a small fraction of their time counseling students about jobs and training.

- Fully one-third of all high school graduates intend to pursue a college degree, while the Labor Department tells us that eighty percent of the jobs available by 1980 will not require one.

I could recite the full litany of symptoms, but you know them as well as I. What they tell us is that our educational system is not responding to the needs of the job market. Nor is it capable of anticipating what those needs will be in the future.

If there is one bright spot in this otherwise dismaying picture, it is in the knowledge that this year we can do something about these vexing problems.

Two events coming together provide us with an unusual opportunity: The first is the initiative created by President Ford in the speech he made last August at Ohio State University. In it, he called for a new initiative to bring the world of learning and the world of work together. That speech has given visibility and momentum to the problems of youth and work.

The second is the expiration this year of portions of the present Vocational Education Act. This gives us the opportunity to shape vocational education to the needs of our time.

But how should we being? The existing law spells out the Federal role clearly enough. It says that Federal vocational aid is meant to encourage states and localities to increase their funding, give high priority to those with special needs, meet emerging problems and increase the number of those in vocational education.

But we believe that the Federal role should be to provide the risk capital for the growth and improvement of vocational education. In other words, we should be providing the impetus for change and innovation.

We do not believe Federal aid is providing enough emphasis in that direction under the present law. The Federal government provides about sixteen percent of all the money spent for vocational education. However, under existing law, we can provide little assurance that this sixteen percent is introducing enough innovation into the field of vocational education.

These needs are urgent:

- We need programs for persons who are now underserved.
- We need to develop ways of keeping vocational education running apace with new manpower needs.
- We need to try out projects that are frankly experimental and involve high risk -- keeping in mind that anything involving high risk also holds forth the promise of high payoff.

Unless we actively encourage these kinds of projects in our funding strategy for vocational education, they will not be done -- and nothing ventured, nothing gained.

That is why the Administration has proposed legislation of its own for vocational education -- the first ever do do that, incidentally.

Our Bill, HR 6251, was introduced a week ago. It has two principal themes: One would shift Federal aid emphasis to research and innovation, where the need is most urgent and where the principal Federal role centers. Another would simplify the administration of vocational education programs in the states. It would accomplish this by eliminating Federal aid categories that rob states of flexibility in the use of funds.

Our bill would continue to provide basic Federal support for traditional programs, but at a reduced level. It is important that we continue this basic support because it helps to offset the additional cost of vocational education, and without that support, states would have to shoulder the full cost of these programs.

However, we believe that our dunding emphasis should now shift to innovative projects. It is the best way to keep vocational education relevant to the rapidly changing demands of the Nation. Instead of this year's $35 million for innovation, we want $160 million. Half would go to states to distribute, the other half to the U. S. Office of Education. But in a real sense, all of it would go to everyone, since everyone benefits from the insights gained by each piece of research or demonstration project.

There are eight critical problem areas that require special funding attention. They include:

- The development of vocational education programs for urban centers with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged persons, unskilled workers, and the unemployed;
- The development of training opportunities for persons living in rural areas and those moving from farms to urban areas;
- The establishment of guidance and placement centers;
- The development and operation of vocational education programs for persons with special needs;
- The ending of sex role-sterotyping in training and employment;
- Meeting the training, counseling and placement needs of unemployed youths and adults;

- Finding ways to relate vocational education to the needs of the labor market;

- Developing and conducting bilingual vocational education programs.

The second major thrust of our bill would aim at giving states the fiscal flexibility they lack under present law. Existing law divides Federal vocational aid into ten line-items and sets funding limits for each.

We think that's wrong. We propose replacing those ten line-item categories with just two.

We also believe that a floor of support is essential in order to meet our national commitment to provide equal educational opportunity. Under our proposal, one-fourth of the states' total federal allotment would go on a matching basis to those groups with special needs: the handicapped, the disadvantaged, and those with bilingual problems.

Our Bill would also encourage better State planning. This is more important than ever if we are to meet the needs of the future. It is also more possible than ever before. Since 1968, the Federal government has invested over $2 million to improve the planning know-how of states. Now it's time to put some of that know-how to work.

Our legislation would have states develop a five-year plan for vocational education. This plan would outline the problems, inventory the resources available for solving them and propose solutions. It would also incorporate the wisdom of the State Advisory Council.

There would also be an annual program plan states would send to us to track progress and give us a mutual foundation for a federal-state dialogue.

This adds up to quite a legislative shopping list. There are no instant miracles in it, and no panaceas. Anyone in search of either is doomed to disappointment.

What is important is to remember that the greatest need we face today in vocational education is to adapt and change. We live in a fast-moving world, full of unexpected developments and unpleasant surprises that no one -- not even the experts -- can predict.

This makes it all the more important that we become flexible enough in our institutional responses to cope with change.

We can do that --

-- if we are willing to change the traditional ingredients of vocational education as the needs of our society demand;

-- if we are open to new ideas and actively seek them out;

-- and, if we equip our young people with a perspective and a philosophy that is itself open to change and adaptation.

In nature, only the adaptable survive. Man must learn to live by that same law -- for it applies to him as well.

That, in essence, is what education is all about.

With your support, we can work together to shape vocational education so that it can meet the needs of a changing world.

Now, for your questions.

GPO 895-036